

## NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

### KEY FINDINGS

#### For grade 8:

- The average mathematics scale score for students in Idaho was 280. This was higher than that of 1990 (271) and was higher than that in 2000 (277).
- Idaho's average score (280) was higher than that of the nation's public schools (276).
- Students' average scores in Idaho were higher than those in 18 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 20 jurisdictions, and lower than those in 14 jurisdictions.
- The percentage of students in Idaho who performed at or above the *Proficient* level was 28 percent. This was greater than that in 1990 (18 percent) and was not found to differ significantly from that in 2000 (26 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* was not found to differ significantly from that for the nation's public schools (27 percent).



This report provides selected results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for Idaho's public-school students at grade 8. Since 1990, mathematics has been assessed in five different years at the state level (at grade 8 in 1990, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2003). In 2003, 53 jurisdictions participated: the 50 states, District of Columbia, Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools, and Department of Defense Dependents Schools (Overseas). Idaho participated and met the criteria for reporting public-school results at grade 8 in 1990, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1992, 2000, and 2003.

NAEP is a project of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). For more information about the assessment, see *The Nation's Report Card, Mathematics Highlights 2003* or *The Nation's Report Card: Mathematics 2003*, which will be available in 2004. The full set of results is available in an interactive database on the NAEP web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>). Released test questions, scoring guides, and question-level performance data are also available on the web site.

The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has provided software that generated user-selectable data, statistical significance test result statements, and technical descriptions of the NAEP assessments for this report. Content may be added or edited by states or other jurisdictions. This document, therefore, is not an official publication of the National Center for Education Statistics.

## Introduction

### What Was Assessed?

The content for each NAEP assessment is determined by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). The development process for mathematics required the active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, local school administrators, parents, and members of the general public. The objectives for each NAEP assessment are described in a "framework," a document that delineates the important content and process areas to be measured, as well as the types of questions to be included on the assessment.

The mathematics framework for the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress replicates the frameworks that guided the 1996 and 2000 mathematics assessments. This framework was developed under the auspices of the College Board and directed by NAGB. The framework calls for questions based on five mathematics content areas: number sense, properties and operations; measurement; geometry and spatial sense; data analysis, statistics and probability; and algebra and functions. Questions were also categorized according to two domains: mathematical abilities and mathematical power. Mathematical abilities describes the types of knowledge or processes required for a student to successfully respond to a question. Mathematical abilities may reflect conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge, or a combination of both in problem solving. The second domain, mathematical power, reflects the processes stressed as major goals of the mathematics curriculum. These include the student's ability to reason, to communicate, and to make connections between concepts and skills either across the mathematics content areas, or from mathematics to other curricular areas.

The framework also incorporates the use of calculators (four-function at grade 4 and scientific at grade 8), rulers, protractors (grade 8), and manipulatives such as spinners and geometric shapes. The use of these ancillary materials and the use of calculators were incorporated into some parts of the assessment, but not all. Calculator use was permitted on approximately one-third of the test questions. The mathematics framework is available on the NAGB web site ([http://www.nagb.org/pubs/math\\_framework/toc.html](http://www.nagb.org/pubs/math_framework/toc.html)).

A combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions was used to assess students' mathematics abilities. Short constructed-response questions ask students to provide the answer for a numerical problem or to briefly describe the solution to a problem. Longer constructed-response questions require students to produce both a solution and a short paragraph describing the solution or its interpretation. For a number of these questions, students can use calculators, protractors, or rulers. Released test questions, along with student performance data by state, are available on the NAEP web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrls/>).

## How Is Student Mathematics Performance Reported?

The results of student performance on the NAEP assessments are reported for various groups of students (e.g., fourth-grade female students or students who took the assessment in different years). NAEP does not produce scores for individual students, or report scores for schools. Nor are data produced for school districts, except that some large urban districts voluntarily participated in the assessment on a trial basis and were sampled as states were sampled. Mathematics performance for groups of students is reported in two ways: 1) average scale scores and 2) achievement levels.

**Scale Scores:** Student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP mathematics scale, which ranges from 0 to 500 and is linked to the corresponding scales in 1990, 1992, 1996, and 2000. Subscales were created to reflect performance on each of the five content areas defined in the NAEP mathematics framework. An overall composite scale was developed by weighting each of the mathematics subscales for the grade based on its relative importance in the framework. This composite scale is the metric used to present the average scale scores and selected percentiles used in NAEP reports.

**Achievement Levels:** Student mathematics performance is also reported in terms of three achievement levels—*Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Results based on achievement levels are expressed in terms of the percentage of students who attained each level. The three achievement levels are defined as follows:

- *Basic:* This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.
- *Proficient:* This level represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.
- *Advanced:* This level signifies superior performance.

The achievement levels are performance standards adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) as part of its statutory responsibilities mandated by Congress. The levels represent collective judgments of what students should know and be able to do for each grade tested. They are based on recommendations made by broadly representative panels of classroom teachers, education specialists, and members of the general public. As provided by law, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), upon review of congressionally mandated evaluations of NAEP, has determined that the achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis until it is determined that the achievement levels are "reasonable, valid, and informative to the public."<sup>1</sup> However, both NCES and NAGB believe these performance standards are useful for understanding trends in student achievement. They have been widely used by national and state officials as a common yardstick for academic performance. The mathematics achievement-level descriptions are summarized in figure 1.

## Cautions in Interpreting Results

The averages and percentages in this report have a standard error—a range of up to a few points above or below the score—which takes into account potential score fluctuation due to sampling error and measurement error. Statistical tests that factor in these standard errors are used to determine whether the differences between average scores or percentages are significant. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller standard errors. As a consequence, smaller differences are detected as statistically significant than in previous assessments.

In this report, statistically significant differences are referred to as "significant differences" or "significantly different." Significant differences between 2003 and prior assessments are marked with a notation (\*) in the tables. Any differences in scores within a year or across years that are mentioned in the text as "higher," "lower," "greater," or "smaller" are statistically significant.

Estimates based on small subgroups are likely to have large standard errors. Consequently some seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant. The reader is cautioned to rely on reported differences in the tables and/or text, which are statistically significant, rather than on the apparent magnitude of any difference. Readers are also cautioned against interpreting NAEP results causally. Inferences related to subgroup performance, for example, should take into account the many socioeconomic and educational factors that may affect student performance.

---

1. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2001).

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

FIGURE  
1

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

### Descriptions of NAEP mathematics achievement levels, grade 8

#### **Basic** Level (262)

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should exhibit evidence of conceptual and procedural understanding in the five NAEP content areas. This level of performance signifies an understanding of arithmetic operations—including estimation—on whole numbers, decimals, fractions, and percents.

For example, eighth-graders performing at the *Basic* level should complete problems correctly with the help of structural prompts such as diagrams, charts, and graphs. They should be able to solve problems in all NAEP content areas through the appropriate selection and use of strategies and technological tools—including calculators, computers, and geometric shapes. Students at this level also should be able to use fundamental algebraic and informal geometric concepts in problem solving.

As they approach the *Proficient* level, students at the *Basic* level should be able to determine which of the available data are necessary and sufficient for correct solutions and use them in problem solving. However, these eighth-graders show limited skill in communicating mathematically.

#### **Proficient** Level (299)

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Proficient* level should apply mathematical concepts and procedures consistently to complex problems in the five NAEP content areas.

For example, eighth-graders performing at the *Proficient* level should be able to conjecture, defend their ideas, and give supporting examples. They should understand the connections among fractions, percents, decimals, and other mathematical topics such as algebra and functions. Students at this level are expected to have a thorough understanding of *Basic*-level arithmetic operations—an understanding sufficient for problem solving in practical situations.

Quantity and spatial relationships in problem solving and reasoning should be familiar to them, and they should be able to convey underlying reasoning skills beyond the level of arithmetic. They should be able to compare and contrast mathematical ideas and generate their own examples. These students should make inferences from data and graphs, apply properties of informal geometry, and accurately use the tools of technology. Students at this level should understand the process of gathering and organizing data and be able to calculate, evaluate, and communicate results within the domain of statistics and probability.

#### **Advanced** Level (333)

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Advanced* level should be able to reach beyond the recognition, identification, and application of mathematical rules in order to generalize and synthesize concepts and principles in the five NAEP content areas.

For example, eighth-graders performing at the *Advanced* level should be able to probe examples and counterexamples in order to shape generalizations from which they can develop models. Eighth-graders performing at the *Advanced* level should use number sense and geometric awareness to consider the reasonableness of an answer. They are expected to use abstract thinking to create unique problem-solving techniques and explain the reasoning processes underlying their conclusions.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses indicate the cutpoint on the scale at which the achievement-level range begins.

SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2002). *Mathematics Framework for the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

## **NAEP Mathematics 2003 Overall Scale Score and Achievement-Level Results for Public School Students**

### **Overall Scale Score Results**

In this section student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP mathematics scale, which ranges from 0 to 500. Scores on this scale are comparable from 1990 through 2003.

Prior to 2000, testing accommodations were not provided for students with special needs in state mathematics assessments. In 2000 only, results were reported for two samples of students: one in which accommodations were permitted and one in which accommodations were not permitted. Subsequent assessment results were based on the more inclusive samples. In the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Table 1 shows the overall performance results of grade 8 public school students in Idaho and the nation. The first column of results presents the average score on the NAEP mathematics scale. The subsequent columns show the score at selected percentiles. The percentile indicates the percentage of students who performed below the score for that percentile. For example, 10 percent of the students had scores that were lower than the score shown for the 10th percentile.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

## Grade 8 Scale Score Results

- In 2003, the average scale score for students in Idaho was 280. This was higher than that of students across the nation (276).
- In Idaho, the average scale score for students in 2003 was higher than that in 1990 (271).
- In Idaho, the average scale score for students in 2003 was higher than that in 1992 (275).
- In Idaho, the average scale score for students in 2003 was higher than that in 2000 (277). Similarly, the average scale score for students across the nation in 2003 was higher than that in 2000 (272).

TABLE 1	The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment					
	Average mathematics scale scores and selected percentiles, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003					

			Average Scale Score	Scale score distribution				
				10th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	90th Percentile
Accommodations not permitted	1990	Idaho	271 (0.8)*	233 (1.5)	252 (0.9)*	273 (1.0)*	292 (1.2)*	309 (1.2)*
		Nation (Public)	262 (1.4)*	214 (1.8)*	237 (1.4)*	263 (1.5)*	288 (1.7)*	307 (1.8)*
	1992	Idaho	275 (0.7)*	236 (1.4)	255 (0.9)	276 (1.0)*	296 (0.8)*	313 (1.3)*
		Nation (Public)	267 (1.0)*	219 (1.5)*	242 (1.5)*	268 (1.1)*	293 (1.3)*	314 (1.6)*
	2000	Idaho	278 (1.3)	235 (2.1)	258 (1.3)	280 (1.1)	301 (1.4)	319 (1.5)
		Nation (Public)	274 (0.8)	225 (2.0)	250 (0.9)*	276 (0.7)	300 (1.2)	321 (1.2)
Accommodations permitted	2000	Idaho	277 (1.0)*	235 (4.4)	257 (1.9)	279 (1.3)	300 (1.3)	318 (1.4)
		Nation (Public)	272 (0.9)*	221 (1.3)*	247 (1.2)*	274 (1.0)*	299 (1.0)*	320 (1.3)
	2003	Idaho	280 (0.9)	237 (2.4)	259 (2.2)	282 (0.9)	302 (1.4)	321 (0.8)
		Nation (Public)	276 (0.3)	228 (0.6)	253 (0.4)	278 (0.4)	301 (0.3)	321 (0.3)

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990–2003 Mathematics Assessments.

## Overall Achievement-Level Results

In this section student performance is reported as the percentage of students performing relative to standards set by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). These performance standards for what students should know and be able to do were based on the recommendations of broadly representative panels of educators and members of the public. In 2000 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Table 2 presents the percentage of students at grade 8 who performed below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at the *Advanced* level. Because the percentages are cumulative from *Basic* to *Proficient* to *Advanced*, they sum to more than 100 percent. Only the percentage of students performing at or above *Basic* (which includes the students at *Proficient* and *Advanced*) plus the students below *Basic* will sum to 100 percent (except for rounding).

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2003, the percentage of Idaho's students who performed at or above the *Proficient* level was 28 percent. This was not found to differ significantly from the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (27 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentage of students who performed at or above the *Proficient* level in 2003 was greater than that in 1990 (18 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentage of students who performed at or above the *Proficient* level in 2003 was greater than that in 1992 (22 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentage of students who performed at or above the *Proficient* level in 2003 was not found to differ significantly from that in 2000 (26 percent).

TABLE 2	The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment			
	Percentage of students at or above each mathematics achievement level, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003			

		Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	Advanced
<b>Accommodations not permitted</b>					
1990	Idaho	37 (1.2)*	63 (1.2)*	18 (1.1)*	1 (0.3)*
	Nation (Public)	49 (1.5)*	51 (1.5)*	15 (1.1)*	2 (0.4)*
1992	Idaho	32 (1.0)*	68 (1.0)*	22 (1.2)*	2 (0.3)*
	Nation (Public)	44 (1.2)*	56 (1.2)*	20 (1.0)*	3 (0.4)*
2000	Idaho	29 (1.5)	71 (1.5)	27 (1.7)	3 (0.5)
	Nation (Public)	35 (0.9)*	65 (0.9)*	26 (1.0)	5 (0.5)
<b>Accommodations permitted</b>					
2000	Idaho	30 (1.3)	70 (1.3)	26 (1.3)	4 (0.4)
	Nation (Public)	38 (1.0)*	62 (1.0)*	25 (0.9)*	5 (0.4)
2003	Idaho	27 (1.2)	73 (1.2)	28 (1.0)	4 (0.5)
	Nation (Public)	33 (0.3)	67 (0.3)	27 (0.3)	5 (0.1)

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

NOTE: The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP mathematics scale: below *Basic*, 261 or lower; *Basic*, 262–298; *Proficient*, 299–332; and *Advanced*, 333 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990–2003 Mathematics Assessments.



## Comparisons Between Idaho and Other Participating States and Jurisdictions

In 2003, 53 jurisdictions participated in the mathematics assessment. These include the 50 states, the District of Columbia and the two groups of Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools: Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) and Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS).

### *Grade 8 Scale Score Comparisons Results*

- Students' scale scores in Idaho were higher than those in 18 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 20 jurisdictions, and lower than those in 14 jurisdictions.

## Comparisons by Average Scale Scores


Figure 2 compares Idaho's 2003 overall mathematics scale scores at grade 8 with those of all other participating states and jurisdictions. The different shadings indicate whether a state's or jurisdiction's average scale score was found to be higher than, lower than, or not significantly different from that of Idaho in the NAEP 2003 mathematics assessment.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

FIGURE  
**2**

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

Idaho's average mathematics scale score compared with scores for other participating jurisdictions, grade 8 public schools: 2003



DDESS: Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools.

DoDDS: Department of Defense Dependents Schools (Overseas).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003 Mathematics Assessment.

### Comparisons by Achievement Levels

Figure 3 permits comparisons of all jurisdictions participating in the NAEP 2003 mathematics assessment in terms of percentages of grade 8 students performing at or above the *Proficient* level. The participating states and jurisdictions are grouped into categories reflecting student performance compared to that in Idaho. The jurisdictions are grouped by whether the percentage of their students with scores at or above the *Proficient* level (including *Advanced*) was found to be higher than, not significantly different from, or lower than the percentage in Idaho. Note that the arrangement of the states and the other jurisdictions within each category is alphabetical; statistical comparisons among jurisdictions in each of the three categories are not included in this report.

### Grade 8 Achievement-Level Comparisons Results


- At grade 8, 18 jurisdictions had higher percentages of students at or above the *Proficient* level than that of Idaho, 17 jurisdictions had percentages that were not significantly different from that of Idaho, and 17 jurisdictions had lower percentages than that of Idaho.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

FIGURE 3

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

Percentage of students within each mathematics achievement-level range, and Idaho's percentage at or above Proficient compared with other participating jurisdictions, grade 8 public schools: By state, 2003



DDESS: Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools.

DoDDS: Department of Defense Dependents Schools (Overseas).

NOTE: The bars above contain percentages of students in each NAEP mathematics achievement range. Achievement levels corresponding to each population of students are aligned at the point where the *Proficient* category begins, so that they may be compared at *Proficient* and above. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003 Mathematics Assessment.

### Mathematics Performance by Demographic Characteristics

This section of the report presents trend results for students in Idaho and the nation by demographic characteristics. Student performance data are reported for:

- Gender
- Race/ethnicity
- Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch
- Type of location (2000 and later)

Definitions of NAEP reporting groups are available on the NAEP web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/mathematics/results2003/interpret-results.asp#RepGroups>).

Each of the variables is reported in tables that present the percentage of students belonging to each subgroup in the first column and the average scale score in the second column. The columns to the right show the percentage of students at or above each achievement-level.

The reader is cautioned against making causal inferences about the performance of groups of students relative to demographic variables. Many factors other than those discussed here, including home and school factors, may affect student performance.

NAEP collects information on many additional variables, including school and home factors related to achievement. All of this information is in an interactive database available on the NAEP web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>).

## Gender

Information on student gender is reported by schools on rosters of students eligible to be assessed.

Table 3 shows scale scores and achievement-level data for public-school students at grade 8 in Idaho and the nation by gender. In 2000 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

### ***Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Gender***

- In Idaho, male students' average scale score was 281 in 2003. This was not found to differ significantly from that of female students (279).
- In 2003, male students in Idaho had an average scale score in mathematics (281) that was higher than that of male students across the nation (277). Female students in Idaho had an average score (279) that was higher than that of female students nationwide (275).
- In Idaho, the average scale scores of both males and females were higher in 2003 than in 1990.
- In Idaho, the average scale scores of both males and females were higher in 2003 than in 1992.
- In Idaho, the average scale scores of both males and females were not found to differ significantly in 2003 from those in 2000.

### ***Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Gender***

- In 2003, 30 percent of males and 27 percent of females performed at or above the *Proficient* level in Idaho. The difference between these percentages was not significant.
- The percentage of males in Idaho's public schools who were at or above the *Proficient* level in 2003 (30 percent) was not found to be significantly different from that of males in the nation (29 percent).
- The percentage of females in Idaho's public schools who were at or above the *Proficient* level in 2003 (27 percent) was not found to be significantly different from that of females in the nation (26 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentages of both males and females performing at or above the *Proficient* level were greater in 2003 than in 1990.
- In Idaho, the percentages of both males and females performing at or above the *Proficient* level were greater in 2003 than in 1992.
- In Idaho, the percentages of both males and females performing at or above the *Proficient* level were not found to differ significantly in 2003 from those in 2000.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
3

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

**Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by gender, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003**

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
<b>Male</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	52 (1.2)	272 (1.0)*	36 (1.4)*	64 (1.4)*	20 (1.6)*	1 (0.4)*
Nation (Public)	51 (1.1)	262 (1.7)*	49 (2.0)*	51 (2.0)*	17 (1.5)*	2 (0.5)*
1992 Idaho	51 (1.0)	277 (1.1)*	30 (1.6)	70 (1.6)	24 (1.7)*	3 (0.6)*
Nation (Public)	52 (0.6)	266 (1.1)*	45 (1.5)*	55 (1.5)*	20 (1.3)*	3 (0.5)*
2000 Idaho	52 (1.2)	278 (1.5)	29 (1.8)	71 (1.8)	28 (2.5)	4 (0.8)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.5)	276 (0.9)	34 (0.9)	66 (0.9)	29 (1.2)	6 (0.6)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	53 (1.1)	277 (1.6)	31 (1.8)	69 (1.8)	27 (1.7)	4 (0.8)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.5)	273 (1.0)*	38 (1.2)*	62 (1.2)*	26 (1.1)*	5 (0.6)
2003 Idaho	51 (1.2)	281 (1.1)	27 (1.5)	73 (1.5)	30 (1.4)	5 (0.6)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.2)	277 (0.3)	33 (0.4)	67 (0.4)	29 (0.3)	6 (0.2)
<b>Female</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	48 (1.2)	270 (0.9)*	38 (1.5)*	62 (1.5)*	16 (1.4)*	1 (0.4)*
Nation (Public)	49 (1.1)	261 (1.4)*	49 (1.7)*	51 (1.7)*	14 (1.2)*	2 (0.5)*
1992 Idaho	49 (1.0)	273 (0.9)*	34 (1.6)*	66 (1.6)*	19 (1.2)*	1 (0.4)*
Nation (Public)	48 (0.6)	267 (1.1)*	44 (1.5)*	56 (1.5)*	20 (1.3)*	3 (0.5)*
2000 Idaho	48 (1.2)	278 (1.8)	28 (2.1)	72 (2.1)	26 (1.9)	3 (0.7)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.5)	273 (1.0)*	36 (1.1)	64 (1.1)	24 (1.0)	4 (0.6)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	47 (1.1)	277 (1.4)	28 (1.8)	72 (1.8)	25 (1.7)	3 (0.6)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.5)	271 (1.0)*	38 (1.3)*	62 (1.3)*	23 (1.0)*	4 (0.5)
2003 Idaho	49 (1.2)	279 (1.1)	28 (1.9)	72 (1.9)	27 (1.5)	3 (0.7)
Nation (Public)	50 (0.2)	275 (0.3)	34 (0.4)	66 (0.4)	26 (0.3)	4 (0.1)

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP mathematics scale: below *Basic*, 261 or lower; *Basic*, 262–298; *Proficient*, 299–332; and *Advanced*, 333 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990–2003 Mathematics Assessments.



## Race/Ethnicity

Schools report the racial/ethnic subgroup that best described the students eligible to be assessed. The five mutually exclusive categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native.

Table 4 shows scale scores and achievement-level data for public-school students at grade 8 in Idaho and the nation by race/ethnicity. In 2000 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

### ***Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity***

- In 2003, White students in Idaho had an average scale score that was higher than that of Hispanic students.
- The average scale score of White students in Idaho was higher in 2003 than in 1990. The difference in the scale score of Hispanic students in Idaho between 2003 and 1990 was not found to be significant.
- The average scale score of White students in Idaho was higher in 2003 than in 1992. The difference in the scale score of Hispanic students in Idaho between 2003 and 1992 was not found to be significant.
- The average scale score of White students in Idaho was higher in 2003 than in 2000. The difference in the scale score of Hispanic students in Idaho between 2003 and 2000 was not found to be significant.

### ***Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity***

- In Idaho in 2003, the percentage of White students performing at or above the *Proficient* level was greater than that of Hispanic students.
- The percentage of White students in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level was greater in 2003 than in 1990. The difference in the percentage of Hispanic students in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level between 2003 and 1990 was not found to be significant.
- The percentage of White students in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level was greater in 2003 than in 1992. The difference in the percentage of Hispanic students in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level between 2003 and 1992 was not found to be significant.
- The differences in the respective percentages of White and Hispanic students in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level between 2003 and 2000 were not found to be significant.



# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
**4**

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

**Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003**

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
<b>White</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	93 (0.7)*	273 (0.7)*	35 (1.3)*	65 (1.3)*	19 (1.2)*	1 (0.4)*
Nation (Public)	73 (0.8)*	269 (1.4)*	41 (1.7)*	59 (1.7)*	18 (1.4)*	3 (0.5)*
1992 Idaho	92 (0.7)*	277 (0.8)*	30 (1.0)*	70 (1.0)*	23 (1.2)*	2 (0.4)*
Nation (Public)	72 (0.6)*	276 (1.1)*	34 (1.4)*	66 (1.4)*	25 (1.2)*	3 (0.5)*
2000 Idaho	88 (1.0)	281 (1.1)	25 (1.2)	75 (1.2)	29 (1.8)	4 (0.6)
Nation (Public)	69 (0.5)*	284 (0.9)*	24 (1.0)*	76 (1.0)*	33 (1.3)	6 (0.6)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	88 (1.1)	280 (1.0)*	26 (1.2)	74 (1.2)	28 (1.4)	4 (0.5)
Nation (Public)	63 (1.2)	283 (0.9)*	25 (1.1)*	75 (1.1)*	33 (1.1)*	6 (0.5)
2003 Idaho	85 (0.9)	284 (0.8)	23 (1.2)	77 (1.2)	31 (1.1)	5 (0.5)
Nation (Public)	62 (0.4)	287 (0.3)	21 (0.3)	79 (0.3)	36 (0.4)	7 (0.2)
<b>Black</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	# (***)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	16 (0.5)	236 (2.8)*	79 (2.4)*	21 (2.4)*	5 (1.1)	# (***)
1992 Idaho	# (0.2)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	17 (0.3)	236 (1.3)*	81 (2.0)*	19 (2.0)*	2 (0.7)*	# (***)
2000 Idaho	1 (0.2)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	14 (0.2)*	245 (1.5)*	70 (1.9)*	30 (1.9)*	5 (0.6)*	# (0.2)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	1 (0.2)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	17 (0.8)	243 (1.3)*	70 (1.6)*	30 (1.6)*	5 (0.7)*	# (0.1)
2003 Idaho	1 (0.2)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	17 (0.3)	252 (0.5)	61 (0.9)	39 (0.9)	7 (0.3)	# (0.1)

Footnotes appear at the bottom of the last page of this table.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
**4**

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

**Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003 (continued)**

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
<b>Hispanic</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	4 (0.5)*	250 (3.7)	64 (6.1)	36 (6.1)	8 (3.0)	# (***)
Nation (Public)	7 (0.5)*	245 (4.4)*	67 (4.5)*	33 (4.5)*	7 (2.1)	1 (0.4)
1992 Idaho	5 (0.6)*	255 (3.0)	59 (6.1)	41 (6.1)	8 (2.7)	# (***)
Nation (Public)	8 (0.4)*	247 (1.2)*	67 (2.0)*	33 (2.0)*	6 (1.0)*	# (0.2)*
2000 Idaho	9 (1.0)	249 (4.7)	66 (7.8)	34 (7.8)	8 (2.6)	# (***)
Nation (Public)	11 (0.3)*	252 (1.8)*	60 (2.2)*	40 (2.2)*	8 (1.1)	# (0.2)*
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	8 (1.2)	250 (4.6)	61 (6.2)	39 (6.2)	7 (2.0)	# (***)
Nation (Public)	14 (0.9)	252 (1.4)*	60 (1.9)*	40 (1.9)*	8 (1.0)*	# (0.2)*
2003 Idaho	11 (0.8)	251 (2.8)	61 (3.8)	39 (3.8)	7 (2.0)	1 (***)
Nation (Public)	15 (0.3)	258 (0.6)	53 (0.9)	47 (0.9)	11 (0.5)	1 (0.1)
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	2 (0.5)!*	275 (5.7)!*	36 (5.4)!*	64 (5.4)!*	30 (6.8)!	6 (3.1)!
1992 Idaho	1 (0.1)!*	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	2 (0.3)*	290 (7.0)	25 (5.8)	75 (5.8)	43 (8.0)	14 (4.9)
2000 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	4 (0.3)*	286 (3.8)	27 (3.7)	73 (3.7)	40 (4.4)	12 (3.1)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	4 (0.4)	287 (3.9)	27 (3.0)	73 (3.0)	40 (4.8)	12 (3.3)
2003 Idaho	1 (0.3)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	4 (0.2)	289 (1.3)	23 (1.2)	77 (1.2)	42 (1.4)	12 (1.4)

Footnotes appear at the bottom of the last page of this table.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
**4**

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

**Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 8 public schools: 1990–2003 (continued)**

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
<b>American Indian</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
1990 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	1 (0.7)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
1992 Idaho	1 (0.4)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	1 (0.2)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
2000 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	1 (0.3)!	264 (7.0)!	47 (10.2)!	53 (10.2)!	14 (4.7)!	2 (***)!
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	1 (0.3)!	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	1 (0.3)!	263 (6.9)!	47 (9.8)!	53 (9.8)!	13 (7.9)!	3 (1.6)!
2003 Idaho	1 (0.2)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)	--- (---)
Nation (Public)	1 (0.1)	265 (1.2)	46 (1.8)	54 (1.8)	16 (1.3)	2 (0.7)

--- Reporting standards are not met. Sample size is insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

# Estimate rounds to zero.

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

(\*\*\*) Standard error estimate cannot be accurately determined.

! The nature of the sample does not allow accurate determination of the variability of the statistic.

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP mathematics scale: below *Basic*, 261 or lower; *Basic*, 262-298; *Proficient*, 299-332; and *Advanced*, 333 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990–2003 Mathematics Assessments.

## **Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility**

NAEP collects data on eligibility for the federal program providing free or reduced-price school lunches. The free/reduced-price lunch component of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) offered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is designed to ensure that children near or below the poverty line receive nourishing meals. This program is available to public schools, nonprofit private schools, and residential child-care institutions. Eligibility is determined through the USDA's Income Eligibility Guidelines, and results for this category of students are included as an indicator of poverty. NAEP first collected information on participation in this program in 1996.

Table 5 shows scale scores and achievement-level data for public-school students at grade 8 in Idaho and the nation by eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch. In 2000 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

## ***Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility***

- In Idaho, 17 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 35 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above the *Proficient* level. These percentages were found to be significantly different from one another.
- For students in Idaho who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above the *Proficient* level (17 percent) was greater than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (11 percent).
- In Idaho, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above the *Proficient* level for 2003 (17 percent) was not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentage for 2000 (16 percent).

## ***Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility***

- Students in Idaho eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average mathematics scale score of 267. This was lower than that of students in Idaho not eligible for this program (287).
- Students in Idaho eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (267) that was higher than that of students in the nation who were eligible (258).
- In Idaho, students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average mathematics scale score in 2003 (267) that was not found to differ significantly from that of eligible students in 2000 (265).

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
5

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch, grade 8 public schools: 2000 and 2003

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
<b>Eligible</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	29 (1.2)*	264 (2.7)	46 (3.6)	54 (3.6)	17 (2.2)	2 (0.7)
Nation (Public)	28 (1.0)*	255 (1.2)*	56 (1.7)	44 (1.7)	10 (0.9)	1 (0.3)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	29 (1.3)*	265 (2.4)	44 (3.2)	56 (3.2)	16 (1.9)	2 (0.8)
Nation (Public)	31 (1.3)*	253 (1.2)*	59 (1.3)*	41 (1.3)*	10 (0.8)	1 (0.2)
2003 Idaho	35 (1.3)	267 (1.5)	40 (2.4)	60 (2.4)	17 (1.6)	1 (0.6)
Nation (Public)	36 (0.4)	258 (0.3)	53 (0.5)	47 (0.5)	11 (0.3)	1 (0.1)
<b>Not Eligible</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	62 (1.5)*	284 (1.4)	22 (1.6)	78 (1.6)	32 (2.2)	4 (0.8)
Nation (Public)	55 (1.8)	285 (1.1)	24 (1.0)	76 (1.0)	35 (1.5)	7 (0.8)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	61 (1.7)*	283 (1.2)*	23 (1.5)	77 (1.5)	31 (1.8)	4 (0.7)
Nation (Public)	54 (1.7)*	283 (1.1)*	26 (1.2)*	74 (1.2)*	34 (1.3)	7 (0.8)
2003 Idaho	56 (1.3)	287 (0.9)	20 (1.2)	80 (1.2)	35 (1.5)	6 (0.7)
Nation (Public)	58 (0.6)	287 (0.3)	22 (0.3)	78 (0.3)	37 (0.4)	7 (0.2)
<b>Information Not Available</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	9 (1.5)	282 (2.3)	23 (3.7)	77 (3.7)	29 (4.5)	3 (2.0)
Nation (Public)	16 (2.1)*	273 (2.1)	37 (2.7)	63 (2.7)	26 (2.3)	4 (1.0)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	10 (1.7)	276 (5.0)	31 (6.1)	69 (6.1)	27 (4.6)	3 (1.2)
Nation (Public)	15 (1.8)*	271 (2.4)*	38 (2.9)	62 (2.9)	24 (2.3)	4 (1.0)
2003 Idaho	9 (0.5)	286 (2.4)	20 (3.3)	80 (3.3)	32 (3.3)	7 (2.1)
Nation (Public)	6 (0.4)	278 (1.3)	32 (1.3)	68 (1.3)	29 (1.5)	6 (0.6)

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP mathematics scale: below *Basic*, 261 or lower; *Basic*, 262-298; *Proficient*, 299-332; and *Advanced*, 333 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2000 and 2003 Mathematics Assessments.

## Type of Location

Schools that participated in the assessment were classified into three mutually exclusive types of community in which the school is located: central city, urban fringe/large town, and rural/small town. These categories indicate the geographic locations of schools. Central city is geographical term meaning the largest city of a Metropolitan Statistical Area and is not synonymous with "inner city."

Recently, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) introduced new methods to identify the type of location assigned to each school in the Common Core of Data (CCD). The new methods were put into place by NCES in order to improve the quality of the assignments, and they take into account more information about the exact physical location of the school. The variable was revised in NAEP beginning with the 2000 assessment; therefore, results are not presented for assessment years prior to 2000.

Table 6 shows scale scores and achievement-level data for public-school students at grade 8 in Idaho and the nation by type of location. In 2000 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 2000 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Type of Location

- In 2003, the percentage of students attending schools in central cities in Idaho who performed at or above the *Proficient* level was not found to differ significantly from the corresponding percentages for students in urban fringes/large towns and rural areas/small towns.
- The differences in the respective percentages of students attending schools in central cities, urban fringes/large towns, and rural areas/small towns in Idaho performing at or above the *Proficient* level between 2003 and 2000 were not found to be significant.

## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Type of Location

- In 2003, in Idaho, the average scale score of students attending schools in central cities was not found to differ significantly from that of students in urban fringes/large towns or rural areas/small towns.
- The differences in average scale scores of students attending schools in central cities, urban fringes/large towns, and rural areas/small towns in Idaho between 2003 and 2000 were not found to be significant.

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

TABLE  
6

## The Nation's Report Card 2003 State Assessment

Average mathematics scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by type of location, grade 8 public schools: 2000 and 2003

	Percentage of Students	Average Scale Score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
<b>Central City</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	17 (0.6)	283 (2.2)	24 (3.2)	76 (3.2)	32 (3.5)	4 (1.7)
Nation (Public)	29 (1.4)	264 (2.2)	47 (2.3)	53 (2.3)	20 (2.1)	4 (0.9)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	18 (0.9)	279 (2.6)	29 (3.4)	71 (3.4)	29 (3.1)	4 (1.2)
Nation (Public)	30 (1.3)	262 (2.2)*	50 (2.3)*	50 (2.3)*	19 (1.7)	4 (0.7)
2003 Idaho	19 (0.9)	281 (1.7)	26 (2.1)	74 (2.1)	29 (2.1)	6 (1.2)
Nation (Public)	27 (0.3)	267 (0.5)	44 (0.7)	56 (0.7)	20 (0.5)	4 (0.2)
<b>Urban Fringe/Large Town</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	23 (1.0)*	280 (2.3)	27 (2.8)	73 (2.8)	29 (3.0)	4 (1.7)
Nation (Public)	45 (2.2)	279 (1.5)	30 (1.6)	70 (1.6)	30 (1.8)	6 (0.7)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	25 (1.3)*	277 (1.7)	30 (2.4)	70 (2.4)	26 (3.0)	4 (1.3)
Nation (Public)	45 (2.0)	276 (1.4)*	33 (1.6)	67 (1.6)	28 (1.5)	5 (0.8)
2003 Idaho	18 (1.1)	280 (2.0)	28 (3.0)	72 (3.0)	29 (2.6)	4 (1.1)
Nation (Public)	42 (0.4)	280 (0.5)	29 (0.5)	71 (0.5)	31 (0.5)	6 (0.3)
<b>Rural/Small Town</b>						
Accommodations not permitted						
2000 Idaho	60 (1.4)	276 (1.8)	31 (2.0)	69 (2.0)	25 (2.0)	3 (0.5)
Nation (Public)	26 (2.0)	277 (1.6)	32 (1.6)	68 (1.6)	26 (2.0)	4 (0.9)
Accommodations permitted						
2000 Idaho	57 (1.4)*	277 (1.6)	30 (1.9)	70 (1.9)	26 (1.8)	3 (0.4)
Nation (Public)	26 (2.0)*	275 (1.6)*	33 (1.7)*	67 (1.7)*	26 (1.8)	4 (0.8)
2003 Idaho	62 (1.2)	280 (1.2)	28 (1.7)	72 (1.7)	28 (1.5)	4 (0.5)
Nation (Public)	31 (0.4)	279 (0.4)	29 (0.5)	71 (0.5)	28 (0.4)	4 (0.2)

\* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2003.

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP mathematics scale: below *Basic*, 261 or lower; *Basic*, 262-298; *Proficient*, 299-332; and *Advanced*, 333 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples and changes in sample sizes. NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. In addition to allowing for accommodations, the accommodations-permitted results for national public schools (2000 and 2003) differ slightly from previous years' results, and from previously reported results for 2000, due to changes in sample weighting procedures.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2000 and 2003 Mathematics Assessments.

---

# NAEP 2003 Mathematics Report for Idaho

---

## What is The Nation's Report Card?

THE NATION'S REPORT CARD, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), is a nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Since 1969, assessments have been conducted periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography, and other fields. By making objective information on student performance available to policymakers at the national, state, and local levels, NAEP is an integral part of our nation's evaluation of the condition and progress of education. Only information related to academic achievement is collected under this program. NAEP guarantees the privacy of individual students and their families.

NAEP is a congressionally mandated project of the National Center for Education Statistics, within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible, by law, for carrying out the NAEP project through competitive awards to qualified organizations.

In 1988, Congress established the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to oversee and set policy for NAEP. The Board is responsible for: selecting the subject areas to be assessed; setting appropriate student achievement levels; developing assessment objectives and test specifications; developing a process for the review of the assessment; designing the assessment methodology; developing guidelines for reporting and disseminating NAEP results; developing standards and procedures for interstate, regional, and national comparisons; determining the appropriateness of all assessment items and ensuring the assessment items are free from bias and are secular, neutral, and nonideological; taking actions to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of results of the National Assessment; and planning and executing the initial public release of National Assessment of Educational Progress reports.

## The National Assessment Governing Board

**Darvin M. Winick, Chair**

President  
Winick & Associates  
Dickinson, Texas

**Amanda P. Avallone**

Assistant Principal and  
Eighth-Grade Teacher  
Summit Middle School  
Boulder, Colorado

**Daniel A. Domenech**

Superintendent of Schools  
Fairfax County Public Schools  
Fairfax, Virginia

**Edward Donley**

Former Chairman  
Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.  
Allentown, Pennsylvania

**Honorable Dwight Evans**

State Legislator  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**Thomas H. Fisher**

Director (Retired)  
Student Assessment Services  
Florida Department of Education  
Tallahassee, Florida

**Sheila M. Ford**

Principal  
Horace Mann Elementary School  
Washington, DC

**Edward H. Haertel**

Professor, School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

**Catherine Harvey**

Principal  
Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School  
Bethesda, Maryland

**Juanita Haugen**

Local School Board Member  
Pleasanton, California

**Honorable Dirk Kempthorne**

Governor of Idaho  
Boise, Idaho

**Kim Kozbial-Hess**

Fourth-Grade Teacher  
Fall-Meyer Elementary School  
Toledo, Ohio

**Honorable Ronnie Musgrove**

Governor of Mississippi  
Jackson, Mississippi

**Mark D. Musick**

President  
Southern Regional Education Board  
Atlanta, Georgia

**Honorable Jo Ann Pottorff**

State Legislator  
Wichita, Kansas

**Diane Ravitch**

Senior Research Scholar  
New York University  
New York, New York

**Sister Lourdes Sheehan, R.S.M.**

Associate General Secretary  
United States Catholic Conference  
Washington, DC

**Honorable Raymond Simon**

Director  
Arkansas Department of Education  
Little Rock, Arkansas

**John H. Stevens**

Executive Director  
Texas Business and Education Coalition  
Austin, Texas

**Deborah Voltz**

Associate Professor  
Department of Special Education  
University of Louisville  
Louisville, Kentucky

**Honorable Michael E. Ward**

State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Public Schools of North Carolina  
Raleigh, North Carolina

**Marilyn A. Whirry**

Twelfth-Grade English Teacher  
Manhattan Beach, California

**Dennie Palmer Wolf**

Director of Opportunity and Accountability  
Annenberg Institute for School Reform  
Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island

**Honorable Grover (Russ) Whitehurst  
(Ex-Officio)**

Director  
Institute of Education Sciences  
U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC

---

**Charles E. Smith**

Executive Director, NAGB  
Washington, DC